IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 12465 of 2005

Between:

V.K.Siraj, S/o.V.K.Azeez Sab,
R/o.D.No.16-12-1/A, Tippukhan Street, Hindupur, Anantapur district.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Regional Transport Authority, Anantapur.
2. K.R.Janardhan Gupta, S/o.Satyanaraiah, R/o.D.No.17-4-51, R.P.G.T.Road, Hindupur, Anantapuur Dist.
3. The Regional Transport Officer, Anantapur.

(R3 is impleaded as per Court order dated 21.06.2005 in W.P.M.P.No.16502 of 2005)

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction declaring the action of the 1st respondent passed in Memo No.2873/C1/2005 dated 08.06.2005, as illegal, arbitrary and one without jurisdiction and consequently direct the 1st respondent to release the vehicle in favour of the petitioner forthwith.

(prayer is amended as per Court order dated 21.06.2005 in W.P.M.P.No.16963 of 2005)

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.O.MANOHER REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 3: GP FOR TRANSPORT

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: MR.S.A.RAZZACK, Advocate

The at the admission stage Court made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the action of the first respondent in detaining the vehicle without there being any order of detention/seizure.

This Court, while ordering notice, directed the first respondent to release the vehicle of the petitioner, if no order of detention was passed. Thereafter, it came to know that an order of detention/seizure was passed. Subsequently, this Court directed the petitioner to produce original documents before the third respondent and, on such production, the third respondent was directed to verify the same and pass appropriate orders. Now, it is represented that in pursuance of the said directions of this Court, the petitioner produced the original documents on 04.07.2005 and the third respondent passed orders on 05.07.2005 rejecting the claim of the petitioner for release of the vehicle.

In view of the subsequent orders passed by the third respondent rejecting the claim of the petitioner, this writ petition does not survive and the same is accordingly closed as infructuous giving

liberty to the petitioner to file a separate writ petition against the orders passed by the third respondent on 05.07.2005. No costs.

_____

18.07.2005

VGB

To

1. The Regional Transport Authority, Anantapur.
2. 2CCs to the Government Pleader for Transport, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad. (OUT)
3. The Regional Transport Officer, Anantapur.
4. 2CD copies.
5. 1 CC to MR.O.Manoher Reddy